

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/929,995	08/15/2001	Noah J. Ternullo	12078-142	9105	
26486 BURNS & LE	7590 01/16/2007 VINSON, LLP	EXAMINER			
(FORMERLY PERKINS SMITH & COHEN LLP)			NANO, SARGON N		
125 SUMMER STREET BOSTON, MA 02110			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2157	•	
				·	
	• ,	•	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			01/16/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.		Applicant(s)		
	09/929,995	TERNULLO ET AL.		
	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Sargon N. Nano	2157		

Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
	Sargon N. Nano	2157				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe			ross			
		•	1622			
E REPLY FILED 13 December 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. ☑ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:						
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	g date of the final rejection.					
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I	The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.					
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	06.07(f).					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b)	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The approprinally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as			
NOTICE OF APPEAL 2. The Netice of Appeal was filed on A brief in com-	olionos with 27 CED 41 27 must be	filed within two month	na af tha data af			
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	e appeal. Since			
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered b	9031189			
(a) They raise new issues that would require further co (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo	nsideration and/or search (see NO		ecause			
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in being appeal; and/or	tter form for appeal by materially re	ducing or simplifying	the issues for			
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		ected claims.	·			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).			
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)	i:	•				
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 	llowable if submitted in a separate,	timely filed amendme	ent canceling the			
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: <u>NONE</u> .		ll be entered and an e	explanation of			
Claim(s) objected to: 1, 3 - 20, 22 - 24, 29 - 42, 45, and 4	<u>47</u> .					
Claim(s) rejected: <u>NONE</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 						
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome all rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fai	ils to provide a			
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	•	, , ,	•			
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.	ut does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowar	nce because:			
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).	7				
13. ☑ Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .		/				
Jam Vall						
	ZARWI SUPERVISORY P	MAUNG MENTENA GUE				
	EITOIOUM P	Tieni exammen	∜			

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: In the remarks applicants argue in substance that A) there is no citation of rejection of claim 47 with respect to the combination of Hendry and wise.

In response to A), examiner contends that was a typographical error and the claim was correctly rejectred with respect to the combnation of Hendrey in view of Kahn (see final office action page 12 - page 13).

Applicants argue that neither Hendrey nor weiss teach or disclose formatting an XML advertisement argument B)

In response to that Hendrey does not diclsoe formatting an advetisement in specific format, however hendrey does not specifically say XML format, it is very well known in the art as evident by Weiss that XML is widely used because it is a simple language and it is compatible with most applications.

Applicants argue that neither hendrey nor weiss discloses sending advertisements from a service or service provider to a transmitter outside the client device argument C)

In response to C, this limitation is not in the claims nowhere in the claims it recites 'sending advertisements from a service or service peovider to a transmitter outside the client device".

Continuation of 13. Other: the IDS submitted under 37 CFR 1.97 (i) filed on 12/21/06 will be placed in file but not considered by the examiner.